Message

From: Strynar, Mark [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5A9910D5B38E471497BD875FD329A20A-STRYNAR, MARK]
Sent: 6/9/2017 3:13:02 PM
To: Smith, Emily J. [Smith.Emily@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Cape Fear River Watershed Study - Deliberative
Attachments: Sun et al. 2016.pdf; DuPont Final Version West Virginia Consent Order for GenX.pdf; Schymanski et al. 2014.pdf; Newton et al. 2017.pdf

FYI,
Mark

From: Lindstrom, Andrew
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 10:22 AM
To: Krasnic, Toni <krasnic.toni@epa.gov>; Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Cape Fear River Watershed Study - Deliberative

Toni,

Here are some things that we talked about in our conversation.

This first is the full version of the Sun et al. paper complete with the SI. Please be sure to examine Figure S1 to see the identity of all of the compounds making up the vast majority of the analytical signal represented in Figure 2 B.

Second is the Consent Order granting permission for the use of GenX in WV specifying that the receiving water body shall not exceed a final GenX concentration of 17.5 ug/L (17,500 ng/L). I don't know if this limitation applies in North Carolina or anywhere else GenX is used. I'm guessing that the 99% control stipulation is what is required nationally.

I've also attached documentation describing the new Schymanski protocol used to identify materials using high resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS). I think this could be used as a method to identify and regulate contaminants that do not have analytical standards available.

The final paper is one of our recent efforts using HRMS to identify contaminants in the Tennessee River in Decatur, Alabama. Many new PFAS were identified in this work that we could reasonably anticipate be of concern for drinking water contamination and human exposure via other routes in this region.

Thank you very much for understanding the importance of this research and for working to provide better control of pollutants emitted to the environment.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Andy

From: Krasnic, Toni
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 9:14 AM
To: Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>; Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>
Subject: Cape Fear River Watershed Study - Deliberative

Hi Mark and Andy,

Hope all is well!

In preparing responses to the media inquiries we've been getting related to the Cape Fear River Watershed results (http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/acs.estlett.6b00398), I had a few questions that I hope you can help me with:

1. Other than at drinking water treatment plant (DWTP) surface waters of Cape Fear River, did you find GenX anywhere else? Was it also found in underground water? Are there other studies that also measured GenX?

2. One possible source of these levels could be non-compliance with the Consent Order. Could these levels be obtained even if the company is in compliance with the consent order (see the attached consent order and consent order terms below)?

a. Consent order terms:

i. For operations in the United States, recover and capture (destroy) or recycle the PMN substances from all the process wastewater effluent streams and air emissions (point source and fugitive) at an overall efficiency of 99% and distribute only to those customers that achieve this percentage of efficiency or destruction.

ii. Distribute the PMN substances only to a person who will either recover and capture (destroy) or recycle the PMN substances from all effluent process streams and air emissions (point source and fugitive) at an overall efficiency of 99%; and

iii. Distribute the PMN substance P-XX-XXX in an aqueous dispersion of the polymer product or on a heat treated solid product such that the contents polymer residual P-XX-XXX cumulative total [ ] are below 200 ppb level using the ASE method developed by Larsen et al with the level of quantification (LOQ) for the standard solution at 0.5 ppb.

3. If we decide to revisit the terms of the consent order, what % efficiency would be required to get the concentrations below OW health advisory levels for PFOS and PFOA? Would it require no releases? Is that obtainable in practice? Do you have any other recommendations for future consent orders on these chemicals?

Thanks,

Toni Krasnic
Existing Chemicals Branch
EPA/OCSPP/OPPT/CCD/ECB
WJC East, 4134D | (202) 564-0984